

Shakespeariana

VOL. V.

NOVEMBER, 1888.

NO. LIX.

HOW DID YOU BECOME A SHAKESPEARE STUDENT?

PART II.

WHEN the question which forms the subject of these papers came to be put to the youngest American Editor of Shakespeare it seemed likely to prove of interest to ask particularly, how he became first, a skeptic, and then an anti-Baconian. Following the suggestion, he has chosen to entitle his answer

MY SHAKESPEARIAN UNCERTAINTIES.

"Up to my attending sessions at Columbia College Law School I had never given Shakespearian matters any special thought or examination. I had always read the plays (a morsel at a time, for reading is like eating, and when one is filled he must stop), and can remember, in my very earliest childhood, absorbing passages which had my own meaning to me, no doubt, but which huge volumes of commentary I have met with since have only rendered less intelligible: but the idea that there was a great field for historical and technical as well as literary research embalmed in these Plays, until then, never entered my mind.

"But at the Law School I made the acquaintance of a young man (my always valued friend, now an esteemed clergyman of the Methodist church) who wrote quantities of what he called 'poetry,' and one evening—to parry an offer on his part to read me a large contingent thereof—showed him a collection of scrap-books I had kept in college,

and of which (disappeared long since) I used to be very proud. He examined them, and suggested preparation of a part of their contents for publication. His suggestion grew into my selecting certain excerpts contained in them, and publishing a little volume, 'Selections of Macaronic Poetry,' through Hurd & Houghton, in 1872.

"About this time Dr. Dwight assigned to our class at the Law School, two moot-court questions for debate. One was upon some branch of real estate law, and the other a question of copyright, involving the ownership of some assumed literary wares not protected by statute, the publication of which was sought to be traced and restrained in equity. So, being a newly-fledged author myself, or believing myself one; naturally, I chose the latter question and began reading up. Desiring to go to the very bottom and inception of the idea of literary property, I read backward. It came upon me as a revelation that, when I arrived at the date of Shakespeare, I was antedating not only all statutes of copyright, but the very idea of Authors' Rights as under equity-jurisdiction—as opposed to common law) itself: As to the first, Milton was yet to be the very earliest to speak for 'the right of every man to his several copy, which God forbid, should be gainsayd.' and, as to the second, Bacon had yet to declare that Chancery could over-ride and correct law (a proposition which Sir Edward Coke was to go to prison rather than concede). The first statute of copyright was to come in 1710, in the days of Queen Anne. In Elizabeth's time there was not only no author's right conceded, but no right to *print*, except the right granted to The Stationers' Company, a monopoly first erected by Philip and Mary. Anything which this monopoly did not print brought the printer under the jurisdiction of Star Chamber, and he was fortunate if he escaped with cropped ears or a slitted nose. Of course, a member of the Stationers' Company could print what he pleased, purchasing or stealing the 'copy' quite at his own sweet will, and—since there was no Chancery to enjoin him—to put anybody's or nobody's name on his title-page exactly as he pleased. I found that Heywood and Sir Thomas Browne had recorded that they were so obliged to stand sponsor for what they never wrote: and then, for the first time, there flashed across my mind the thought—

why should not Shakespeare have so suffered, if his works were so popular as to be printed at all? The question seemed to me an historical one and worthy of examination. I had read Judge Holmes's elaboration of Miss Delia Bacon's idea that Lord St. Albans—(when plain Francis Bacon) had been the real Shakespeare. But either my ear or my sense of literary art were too coarse for me to accept this result, reasoning as they did from the parallelisms in the phraseology and the coincidences in the philosophies of Shakespeare and the admitted Baconian works. The true line seemed to me to be to look at externals alone, and the pursuit of this line of research very soon became an appetite with me. On leaving the law school I became immersed in the practice of my profession, and it was not until six years later—October, 1877, that I found leisure to put a line of my thoughts on paper. I showed my manuscript to Mr. O. B. Bunce, then editor of *Appleton's Journal* (which became defunct in 1882, because Mr. Bunce made it too good to live). But he did not find a place for it until February, 1879, when it appeared under the title I afterwards retained for the book—'The Shakespearian Myth.' When I prepared that manuscript, and, still more, when I saw it in print, I supposed my breast relieved of all I believed or felt on the matter, and that, so far as I was concerned, the matter was closed forever. But little did I know of the future that was in store. Answers to my paper seemed to pour in on every side; in newspapers, magazines and reviews. Of their exact number I have no definite statement,—Mr. Wyman has enumerated thirty-seven of the longer and more elaborate of them in his exhaustive *Bibliography of the Shakespeare-Bacon Controversy*—but my memory is, that there were nearly two hundred of these replications and rejoinders (of private letters I shall speak later on). Of course, it had been impossible, in a paper of eleven thousand words (which afterwards became the first chapter of my book) to go into details. But when I saw every one of my propositions questioned, the zeal of the advocate in me overcame my determination to 'rest' (as the lawyers say) and although immersed in many affairs, I found or manufactured leisure to prepare a second article, giving the facts which appeared to justify the conclusions in my first paper, taking

as a text a paper 'Shakespeare and the Musical Glasses,' which Mr. Bunce selected out of two or three dozen as the most courteous of the answers sent to *Appleton's Journal*, and printed in his issue of April, 1879. My second paper (now Chapter II. of the 'Myth') Mr. Bunce printed in June, 1879, and once again I supposed the matter closed, so far as I was concerned, and turned to other diversions. But my friends continued to send me criticisms and attacks upon the two papers. Letters literally poured upon me, showing that I had not yet made what seemed to me the reasons for my conclusions clear, and in May, 1880, I found to my surprise that I had prepared (as possible difficulties suggested themselves to me to be overcome), a manuscript of 32,000 words on my desk. This Mr. Bunce printed in *Appleton's Journal*, in the June and July issues of 1880. The work 'The Shakespearean Myth' was made up of these four articles exactly in the order in which *Appleton's Journal* had published them. It has been translated into German, and is on the eve of its third American edition.

"In November, 1882, just one year after the appearance of the volume, I printed a pamphlet of fifty pages, not to add to the argument of the work itself, but to answer specifically the five or six strongest of ninety-three elaborate reviews thereof. All the criticisms thus attended to were carefully written. But of these five or six, one appearing in the *Washington Post* of April 24th, 1882 (written, as I afterwards learned, by a lady of that city who had never given any special study to Shakespeare at all), was incomparably the most original, philosophical, and forcible.

"When I look at the bulk of matter I have inflicted on the groaning book-sellers' columns, and reflect that my own hand has held the wicked quill which is responsible for it all, I feel that a rigid pen paralysis is the least punishment I deserve.

"As to book-reviewing as now conducted in England and America—from *The Athenæum* to the 'patent outside'—except commercially, it is of no value whatever: and publishers tell me that the difference between a good and a bad review of a book is hardly a dollar either way. There are all sorts of purchasers, and their curiosity is quite as apt (some say considerably more apt) to be stimulated by a 'crusher'

as by a 'boomer.' For example, I was once considerably annoyed by a review in the N. Y. *Evening Post*, which denounced two of the publications of the New York Shakespeare Society as 'Baconian' whose authors certainly had no such bias in writing them. But, before I could protest, our agents had received a dozen orders for the books from Baconians who otherwise certainly would not have admitted one of our books upon their premises. So much for the *Secundum quid*. As Touchstone says: 'In respect that it is in the fields, it pleaseth me well; but in respect that it is not of the Court it is tedious.' And so everything in this world is compared with the standard or standpoint of the private judgment or 'bias' of the person making the comparison; and—unless we can find an unprejudiced third party to hear and decide for us—by discussing a question we only add material for the final arbiter who is to come—heaven knows when—certainly not in our day and date!

"I suppose I ought not to close up the record of my Shakespearian uncertainties and divigations (which I am proud to say, however absorbing, I have never allowed to interfere with my regular occupations, or with the rights of those who had substantial claims to my time) without alluding to my correspondence. As to this I can say all in a word, by stating that within the last month I have piously made an *auto da fe* of over three thousand personal letters, the large majority of which I must have answered or invited. I did so with great regret, for many of them were very amusing. Some of them threatened me with the ghost of Shakespeare; the curse carved upon his Stratford slab; with the pangs of remorse, of guilty conscience, and with the disgrace which the shameful things I had written would indubitably bring upon my old age.

"My experience as a Shakespearian student is very emphatically that it is easily the most absorbing of relations: but that the pleasure of it depends principally and wholly upon the right to see things as they strike one's self (in other words, it depends upon a freeman's right to disagree with his fellow students *ad libitum*). The least dogmatism, the least insistance on subjective methods makes it (in my opinion) at once a bore and a nuisance as vast as it was before an ornament and

a delight. We want the right to agree or to disagree; and, to do that, we must have first of all a Forum. If I may be allowed in any way to describe myself as the founder of the New York Shakespeare Society, I may say, I founded it in the sincere hope that it would provide just such a Forum. But if the day shall ever come when anybody with anything to say on a Shakespearian theme will be debarred its floor, or the attention of its benches, nobody will be more eager than I to wind it up. A great deal is said about 'Bias.' For myself, I believe in 'Bias.' An honest advocate cannot be without 'bias' for his own side. Let him leave the 'bias' on the other side to his learned and courteous opponent. The value of a decision between them depends exactly upon the fullness and freedom of the respective 'biasses' pro and con, and must be credited not only to the judge or the referee pronouncing it, but equally to the two biassed advocates who argued before him. If it be a truism (as I think it is) that Shakespeare is the most catholic, many-sided and kaleidoscopic of authors, then how ridiculous to insist that whatever any one student gets out of him is the only thing that is in him, and that all other students must accept and bend to that!

"I remember my good friend, Dr. Theobald, of London, expostulating with me for going as far as I did, and then stopping just short of the goal he and the Bacon Society had reached. 'You walk right up to Bacon's door, and then you squat on the door-step and refuse to knock,' he said. That was then exactly the situation—it could not have been more forcibly expressed. But, even then, the reason why I squatted without knocking, was because, had I knocked, possibly the ripe old lawyer and philosopher himself might have come out and cried, 'Why do you come here?—all this evidence that you say leads you to disturb me is only negative evidence at best. One single breath of positive assertion will puff it all away. How do you know but that I had a reason for not breathing that assertion? How do you know that that assertion may not be forthcoming? I did not discover the law of gravitation, of the circulation of the blood, of continental growth—nor did Shakespeare. Perhaps all these great truths were in the air—were all about us—just as evolution was in your nineteenth century

air long before your great Darwin pronounced it. In the twenty-second century, the student of your nineteenth century literature will find as many parallelisms between your great authors as you find between me and Shakespeare, Montaigne and Marlowe. Why do you disturb my peaceful ghost? What is your warrant and authority?

"Having carried myself so far, (and it is impossible to write of one's self without frequent employment of what my friend Brander Matthews calls 'the perpendicular pronoun') I think the reader will see me well on the way to a belief in Shakespeare rather than in any Baconian or other Spectre of the Brocken which might temporarily arise in his place. For, fighting for independence of conviction, and resenting all these dogmatisms, was it not inevitable—the moment a Baconian dogmatist arose, who declared the question settled *beyond a doubt*, and the discussion forever closed—no more to be said—that I would still be found a non-conforming doubter? What would have become of the argument of my 'Shakespearean Myth' for example, had I accepted such a cock-sure settlement of the whole question as Mr. Donnelly's cipher? That argument was—that in accounting for any phenomena, natural explanations should always be exhausted before supernatural, abnormal, and unusual ones are considered. That is to say, in the present case, if Mr. Donnelly finds a continuous narrative in piecemeal in the plays written in nineteenth century English, it is more reasonable and natural to suppose that Mr. Donnelly, in good faith, found it there in the nineteenth century than that Francis Bacon put it there in the seventeenth. For there is no limit to human ingenuity, and it is far more reasonable to suppose that an ingenious man may, in perfect good faith, deceive himself than that Lord Bacon, under the historical circumstances, and in the situation given, described one kind of cipher in his *De Augmentis*, and used entirely another in a series of plays which, if he had written at all, he had written under another man's name, and besides, have written it in a prophetic idiom that was to be the idiom of two centuries after his own funeral? What jury in a court of justice in the land but would rather accept the testimony of the most notorious liar in the neighborhood

that the sun set at its usual hour, in preference to that of the rector, wardens and vestry, that it shone all night? Having rejected the dogmatic Baconian, as I had already rejected the dogmatic Shakespearian, the next step followed at once. 'Shakespeare could not have written the plays, and—Shakespeare disposed of—only Bacon is left,' was the Baconian thesis up to 1888. But now comes Mr. Donnelly and admits that the names of Montaigne, Marlowe, Burton, can be added to the possibilities of Baconian authorship. Therefore, not only is the claim of a pure Baconian authorship killed by over proof at Mr. Donnelly's hands, but what I called 'The Shakespearian Myth,' (*i.e.*, my compromise or anti-Shakespearian, or 'Editorial' theory) is knocked in the head by precisely the same club. For, certainly, if we can only prove Bacon to have been Shakespeare by the same processes that we can prove him to have been Montaigne or Marlowe or Burton, we cannot prove him to have been Shakespeare at all!

"To close at once, lest I trespass too far upon the pages of SHAKESPEARIANA, let me confess that the mystery of Shakespeare is just where I found it, and just where Mr. Donnelly found it, and where all the rest of us have found it. None of us have budged it the millionth part of an inch. It is only ourselves we have disturbed.

The mortal remains of William Shakespeare were laid to rest under the splendid epitaph:—

*'Judicio Pylum, genio Socratem, arte Maronem,
Terra tegit, populus mœrat, Olympus habet.'*

"Whoever caused those lines to be carved could not have believed their subject a makeshift and a trimmer of other people's wares. The utmost application of the rule *nil nisi* could not have wrung those words from an unbelieving heart. They prove nothing. But, in their presence, evidence that the man to whom they were inscribed was an impostor has but sorry chance of a hearing amidst the babel of controversy which the divine plays carry in their train. 'I have in my mind,' says Edward Engel, 'I have in my mind the immense figure of a man, sitting high on a rocky summit; at his feet, storm

tempest, and the raging of the sea, but his head in the beams of heaven. This is Shakespeare; only with this addition, that far below, at the foot of his rocky throne, are murmuring crowds who expound, preserve, condemn, defend, worship, slander, overrate and abuse—and of all this he hears nothing!’ And perhaps the best we can wish is that his great Shade shall continue oblivious forever of ‘Verse Tests,’ ‘Parallelisms’ and ‘Ciphers,’ and of as many other Shakespearian fads and fashions of the day as can be conveniently suppressed. There are theories and theories; but (with the exception of Mr. Donnelly and Dr. Furnivall), I know of nobody who, in these matters, is certain about anything.

“As to matters Shakespearian there is certainly a mystery somewhere: the digressions in the Shakespeare plays—the allusions and analogies put into the mouths of the *dramatis personæ*—the range of thought and experience their speeches show: certainly are wider and deeper than would be expected of a mere playwright enriching himself by legitimate practice of his profession. My honored friend, Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, is doing marvels to enlighten this mystery from the Shakespearian standpoint. I hope the Bacon Society of London will yet see the expediency of devoting less of its time to mere argumentation and ‘parallelism,’ and of at least making a fair effort to clear up the unaccounted for years of Francis Bacon’s London life: of showing him in some correspondence with his contemporaries from which we may infer as to the circumstantial probability of those propositions as to which (could they be settled by pen and ink) Judge Holmes has already covered the field.

“APPLETON MORGAN.”

MR. W. H. WYMAN’S LETTER.

“You ask how it all came about that I became a Bacon-Shakespeare Bibliographer? It does not seem to be of sufficient importance to dwell upon, but I cannot allow myself to decline your polite request. I comply with less hesitation, as surprise has been repeatedly expressed that one who is not a skeptic, and who has no doubts on the subject, should have been at such pains to collect all the doubts of others.

"Well, I think that it was primarily because I was in need of an occupation for leisure hours—in plain words, a hobby. I have come to believe that everybody needs one. The hobbyists are much maligned. A hobby, after all, is nothing more than some specific field of thought or labor—and usually it is a side issue, and need not interfere with the sterner duties of life. It is not given to any one mortal to master the whole field of science or literature. We cannot all be like Bacon, who deemed his province to be "all knowledge," nor like Shakespeare, to whom all knowledge seemed intuitive. Is it not better, then, for ourselves and for our kind to know one thing well than a dozen superficially?

"But I am digressing. I think the first article I read on the subject—perhaps in 1880—was Vaile's paper (title 85) in *Scribner* of 1875, which was then, and still is, the most impartial and complete summary of both sides of the question. This led me to seek Delia Bacon's book. It was out of print, which entailed a long pursuit. It was advertised for by a bookseller through the usual channels, and after some months of search a second-hand copy came in through private hands from a remote Illinois town. Within its leaves I found several newspaper cuttings on the subject—amongst others, one without name of paper, date, or the real name of the author, containing a beautiful tribute to Miss Bacon. The glowing terms in which she was spoken of made me anxious to ascertain something more, not only as to Delia Bacon herself but as to the author of the article and its source. (It proved to be by Mrs. Henshaw, title 49). This little scrap of paper was the real starting point of the *Bibliography*. The interest it excited and the data obtained while tracing it, induced me to make an effort to gather all that had been written on the subject by way of ascertaining for my own information what basis there was for any doubts.

"After securing the more noted and important works, it struck me that a bibliography might be useful to others. Hence the little list of twenty-five titles in the *Madison (Wis.) Journal* of April 24, 1882.

"After that, the *Bibliography* commenced to grow. Old articles came to light, and new interest was excited in the question by successive publications, until it has now reached to more than 400 titles.

Very few appreciate the real extent of this literature. What was amusement at first became work at last—and hard work at that. Not the least of the difficulties was in procuring a copy of each one of the books and articles titled. But besides these, there are in my library more than 3,000 printed articles, including everything from a newspaper's quib up to papers that are long and valuable though not important enough to title. Personally I would be glad to see some conclusion to the controversy and consequently to the *Bibliography*. If I keep on, it seems endless; if I stop, it leaves a work that is incomplete. I have put together something, which like the demon in Frankenstein, it is impossible to get rid of. There is no hope of that, for as long as there is paper to write on, or presses to print, there will be doubters.

“W. H. WYMAN.”

ANNALS OF THE CAREERS OF WILLIAM BOYLE,
SAMUEL ROWLEY, AND WILLIAM BIRD
OR BORNE.

1597, August 10.—W. Borne engaged with Herstow to play with the Admiral's men at the Rose, and not in any other house public about London for three years. Henslowe's Diary, p. 258.

1599, November 16.—Charles Mugsey and Samuel Rowley made a similar engagement until Shrovetide, 1601. H. D., p. 250. But they belonged to the company in March 1698. H. D., p. 120.

1601, December 20–24.—Borne and Rowley receive £6 for *Judas*.

1692, September 27.—Rowley received £7 for *Joshua*. There is no good reason for attributing *Sampson*, 29th July, 1602, to him.

1602, November 22.—Bird and Rowley receive £4 for additions to Marlowe's *Faustus*: these additions are no doubt included in the 1616 edition (Ward's *Faustus*: Appendix A, by Fleay).

1605, February 12.—*Henry 8* or *When you see me you know me* was entered S. R. This is the only extant production of G. Rowley's.

1612.—*Hymen's Holiday* or *Cupid's Vagaries*, by Rowley, was acted at court on Shrove Monday. It was again acted at court 16th December, 1633. It was in the possession of the cockpit players in 1639.

1628, July 27.—*Richard 3* or *The English Prophet*, with the re-formation written by S. Rowley was licensed to the Palsgrave's players at the Fortune. Tragedy.

1623, October 29.—*Hard Shift for a Husband's* or *Bilbo's the best Blade* was licensed to the same by Rowley. A new comedy.

1624, April 6.—*Match or No Match*, a new comedy by S. Rowley, was licensed to the Fortune company.

It appears that S. Rowley remained with the same company through all their changes of name—Admiral's, Prince Henry's, Palsgrave's, Fortune. Nothing more is known of him.

The Noble Spanish Soldier, by S. R., published 1634, was entered as by Dekker, and no doubt was written by him and Day. See under their *Annals* William Boyle author of *Jurgurtha*, H. D., p. 9, February 1600: and relicensed, p. 3, May, 1624, was a distinct person from Borne or Bird. *Jurgurtha* was never acted by Prince Henry's players. The license was granted to Prince Charles's men at the Curtain.

F. G. FLEAY.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE "TAMING OF THE SHREW."

BY TALCOTT WILLIAMS.

(Continued.)

THE remaining references in this bibliography divide themselves into "Comment," under which I include references to the play, wherever I found them, arranged by periodicals and authors, with cross-references, and "Performances" arranged by time. The latter is somewhat overloaded with allusions to the appearance of Mr. Daly's company in this country, in England, and in France; but as I have often regretted omissions in the bibliographies of others, as others will in this, and never yet blamed a man for too many titles, I have been freer with the later and recent references, than a fair perspective of my subject would justify.

COMMENT.

ACADEMY. London, 1877, page 297. Sep. 22. A fresh allusion to Shakspeare, by F. J. Furnivall.

Calls attention to Rowland's reference, 1809, and mis-spells the text.

ALL THE YEAR ROUND. London, 1880, vol. 24, page 511-516, (April 24, 1880). *The Taming of the Shrew*.

Chiefly occupied with an account of successive presentations and stage versions, full and valuable. Reference in Poole is to vol. 44.

ATHENÆUM. London, 1887, page 365-6, No. 2785, March 12, *The Taming of the Shrew*, by Karl Elze.

Gives notes on (ref. to Globe Ed.) Ind. i. 44, 49, Act. i. sc. 2, l. 146; Act. iv. sc. 1, l. 125; Act. i. sc. 2, l. 5; Act. iv. sc. 1, l. 144.

— — London, 1878, pages 658-9, No. 2865. Nov. 23. *The Taming of the Shrew*, by F. G. Fleay.

Gives reasons for assigning 1594 to the play as written by Shakespeare's coadjutor (Lodge), 1596 to the rewriting of the Shakespearian scenes with Katherine and Petruchio, and 1604 to the final revision in its present condition.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY, March and April, 1885. Time in Shakespeare's comedies, by Henry A. Clapp. Pages 386-403. Pages 543-561. Pages 545-546.

The article divides the comedies into three classes, p. 387, and places *The Taming of the Shrew* in the third, in which the lapse of time, it is indicated scantily obscurely or not at all, and analyzes *The Taming of the Shrew*, pages 545-546.

BÖRSENZEITUNG, Berlin, 1887, No. 93. Feuilleton, p. 3-4, Feb. 24. Das Motiv zu Shakespeare's *Bezühmung der Widerspänstigen*.

BULLOCK, JOHN. Studies on the text of Shakespeare: with numerous emendations and appendices. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1878. 8vo, min., p. xii, 335.

Omits three plays, but includes *The Taming of the Shrew*.

CLAPP, HENRY A. See *Atlantic Monthly*, March and April, 1885. Time in Shakespeare's Comedies. See *Advertiser, Boston Daily*, May 24, 1887. (Performances.)

COHN, ALBERT. Shakespeare in Germany in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. London: Arber & Co., 1865. Quarto, p. cxxxvii, 422; p. cxxiv-cxxx.

Gives German adaptations beginning with 1672.

COKAIN, SIR ASTON. Small Poems of Divers Sorts. Small 8vo, 1658. Page 224 mispaged 124. Bk. II., epigram 69.

This work also appeared under "Choice Poems of Several Sorts," under which it is collated in W. C. Hazlitt's "Collection and Notes," 1876, p. 93, with three other titles.

COLLIER, J. Payne. Memoirs of the principal actors in the plays of Shakespeare, Printed for the Shakespeare Society. 8vo; p. xxxviii, (2.) 296; London, 1846. Page 151-158.

Discusses William Sly's connection with the part of like name in the *Taming of the Shrew*.

— — Notes and Emendations to the Text of Shakespeare's Plays. London. Printed for the Shakespeare Society, 1852, p. xxvi, (4) 512. Page 141-154.

These Notes were republished in New York, and form a supplemental volume to Collier's Shakespeare.

— — Notes and Emendations to the Text of Shakespeare's Plays. 12mo, 541, New York. Page 163-176.

— — Shakespeare's Library. A collection of the plays, romances, novels, poems and histories employed by Shakespeare in the composition of his works. With introduction and notes. Second edition, greatly revised and greatly enlarged. The text now first formed from a new collation of the original copies [by W. Carew

Hazlitt]. Part I, 4 vols.; Part II, 2 vols. London: Reeves & Turner, 1875, 12mo. Vol. I, p. xx, 412; II, p. iv, 353; III, p. iv, 418; IV, p. iv, 448; V, p. vi, 520; VI, p. iv, 542.

Contains Vol. IV: *Taming of a Shrew*. (1) "Story of the induction," from Goulart's "Admirable and memorable histories," 1607, p. 537. (2) "The waking man's fortune," fragment of an old story-book. Containing an incident similar to that of the tinker. (3) "The shrewd and curst wife lapped in morel's skin," a poem.

Vol. VI: *Taming of a Shrew*. The old comedy of the "Taming of a Shrew." 1594.

— History of Dramatic Poetry. III. Page 77.

COLERIDGE, SAMUEL TAYLOR. Seven Lectures on Shakespeare and Milton. A list of all emendations in Mr. Collier's folio, and an introductory preface by J. P. Collier. 12mo, p. 275. London, 1856. Pages 185-187.

The reference is to Collier's Emendations. If there is a reference in the Lectures, I did not find it.

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. April, 1885, Vol. 47, p. 517-535. Shakespeare's Portraiture of Women, by Edward Dowden, 528-529.

Reprinted in SHAKESPEARIANA, May, 1885, and September, 1885.

DANIEL, P. A. Time Analysis. See New Shakspeare Society Transactions.

DALL, CAROLINE HEALEY. What we really know about Shakespeare. Boston: Roberts Bros., 1886. 12mo, p. 204. Page 158.

Points out the importance of names and allusions in the Induction in the Baconian controversy. "It was not in the least likely Bacon ever heard of Wincoot fools."

DEKKER. The pleasant comodie of *Patient Grizzell*. As it hath beene sundrie Times lately plaid by the Right Honourable the Earle of Nottingham (Lord High Admiral) his Servants. London, 1603.

Bought out in 1599, and Act V, Sc. 2, has line "I will learn your medicine to tame shrews." Frey.

DAVIS, L. CLARKE. See *Inquirer*, Philadelphia. (Performances.)

DOWDEN, EDWARD. See *Contemporary Review*, April, 1885. Shakespeare's Portraiture of Women.

DYER, T. F. THISTLETON. Folk-lore of Shakespeare. New York: Harper & Bro. 8vo, p. viii, 559. Pages as given below.

Without assuming to cover all the references to *Taming of the Shrew*, I give the following, the reference being to the pages of "Folk-lore," the word, act, and scene. 161-165, Ape, II, 1; 449, Boots are green, III, 2; 350, Clamorous smack, III, 2; 354, Dame barefoot, II, 1; 451, Joint-stool, II, 1; 446, Little pot, IV, 1; 353, Married o' Sunday, II, 1; 113, My hen, II, 1; 464, Pitchers have ears, IV, 4; 442, Whipped at high-cross, I, 1; 159, Woodcock, I, 2; 161.

EDWARDS, RICHARD. London, 1570 (?)

Collection of comic stories, containing one dealing with the story of the Induction.

— — — (?) The Waking Man's Dreame.

This is the fragment in Shakespeare Society Papers, Vol. II, and is in the Shakespeare Library, Vol. IV, p. 400-414. Only a part of the work, "The Fifth Event," exists.

ELZE, KARL. Essays on Shakespeare. Translated by L. Dora Schmitz. 8vo, p. 379. London, 1874. Essay VII, p. 289-291; 300-301.

Collates references in the play to Italy, by way of supporting theory of Shakespeare's visit there. A second edition enlarging on this appeared in 1888.

— — — Notes on Elizabethan dramatists, with conjectural emendations of the Text. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1880, 4to, page viii, 136.

Contains five emendations, lxxviii-lxxxi on the *Taming of the Shrew*.

— — — Notes on Elizabethan dramatists, with conjectural emendations of the text. Second series. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1884, 4to, p. viii, 207.

Emendations cccxli-cccl are on passages in the *Taming of the Shrew*.

— — — Notes. Halle: E. Karras, Printer, December, 1882. 8vo, 1, 17.

Contains Notes on *The Taming of the Shrew*. Act 1, sc. 1, "Let's be no stoics, nor no stocks, I pray;" act 1 sc. I, "I will some other be," etc., to "meaner man of Pisa" Only 50 copies printed.

— — — See *Athenæum*, 1878, p. 366. March 12, No. 2785. *The Taming of the Shrew*.

FLEAY, F. G. See *Athenæum*, 1878, p. 658-9. *The Taming of the Shrew*.

— — — Shakespeare Manual. London, 1876.

This article enlarges on the hypothesis in the New Shakspeare Society Transactions, Vol. I.

— — — Authorship. See New Shakspeare Society Transactions.

— — — Did Shakespeare read Clem Robinson's "Handfull of Pleasant Delites," 1584. See SHAKESPEARIANA, I, 54.

Shakespeare did use it, quoted *Taming of the Shrew*, iv, 1.

— — — Shakespeare and Marston. See SHAKESPEARIANA, II, 101-106, 136-140. Page 136.

FREY, ALBERT R. See SHAKESPEARIANA, IV, pp. 117-119. Abstract of paper read, January, 1887, on *Taming of the Shrew*. Pages 297-316. The Taming of a Shrew and the Taming of the Shrew.

This is reprinted in the *Bankside Shakespeare*.

— — — William Shakespeare and Alleged Spanish Prototypes, by Albert R. Frey. Read before the (New York) Shakespeare Society, Jan. 23, 1886. Foolscape 8vo, p. 41, swd.

Reviews alleged originals of eight plays. A review of the pamphlet is in SHAKESPEARIANA, III, 419-420.

FURNIVALL, F. J. See *Academy*, 1848, p. 297, Sept. 22. A Fresh allusion to Shakespeare.

GALAXY. New York, Vol. X, July '70, Jan. '71, Dec., '71. Page 853-861. By Abby Sage Richardson. Shakespeare as a Plagiarist.

Inclines to the belief that Robert Greene wrote the earlier play.

GERVINUS, C. G. Shakespeare Commentaries, 8vo, 2 vols., i-xvii, 664. London, 1863. Pages 185-206.

GLENNIE, JOHN S. STUART. Shakespeare and the Stratford on Avon Common Fields. SHAKESPEARIANA, II, 363-397.

"Six of his plays may have been written after 1611. One of these almost certainly, the *Taming of the Shrew*:" with discourse on the Induction as a very transcript of scenes and characters in the neighborhood of Stratford on Avon, p. 376.

GREENE, ROBERT. Menophon Camillus. London, 1589.

The register of Stationers' company contains, in 1589, the following: "23^o die Augusti, Sampson Clerke Entred for his copie Menophon Camilius allarum to slumberinge Ephewes in his melancholy cell at Silexandria. Under the handes of Master doctour Staller and both the Wardens. Vid." This work contains satirical allusion to the *Taming of a Shrew* Frey.

GRIFFITH, MRS. The Morality of Shakespeare's Drama. Illustrated. In two volumes. Dublin: Printed for J. Beatty, Skinner Row, 1777. I, xiv-298; II (4), 307. Pages 151-161.

"The business of this play, declared by the title, is, I fear, a work rather of discipline than precept." The Italics are Mrs. Griffith's. Gives extracts with comment, demurring that "passive obedience is carried perhaps rather a little too far in the four lines beginning, 'Then vail your stomachs.'"

HALLIWELL (PHILLIPPS), JAMES ORCHARD. A brief hand-list of the early quarto edition of the Plays of Shakespeare, with notices of the old impressions of the poems. London: Printed for Private circulation, 1860. 8vo, 23. Page 4.

— Shakespeareana. A catalogue of the early edition of Shakespeare's Plays, and of the commentaries and other publications illustrative of his works. London: John Russell Smith, 1841. 8vo, 46. Page 9.

First edition and three titles.

— Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare. The Second Edition. 8vo, p. 1-703. London, 1882. Pages 156-155. Pages 296-299.

Both references contain matter of value bearing on the play and pointing out its connection with the scenes of Shakespeare's early life.

HARINGTON, SIR JOHN. A new discourse of a Stale Subject, called the Metamorphosis of Ajax: Written by Miacosmos; to his friend and cousin Philostipnos. At London, printed by Richard Field, dwelling in the Black-friers, 1596. 12mo, p. 80.

"Reade the booke of *Taming a Shrew*, which hath made a number of us so perfect, that now every one can rule a Shrew in our countrye save he that hath hir."

HAZLITT, W. CAREW. Collections and Notes. 1867-1876. London : Reeves & Turner, 196 Strand, 1876.

Note on *Taming of a Shrew*, 1594. No. 109, Sotheby's collection of the "Rarest of Old Plays," sold April 12, 1826, is the one later Inglis, Heber's and Duke of Devonshire.

— Characters of Shakespeare's Plays, by William Hazlitt. London : Printed by C. H. Reynell, 21 Piccadilly, for R. Hunter, successor to Mr. Johnson, in St. Paul's Church-yard; and C. & J. Ollier, Wellock st.; Cavendish Square, 1817. 8vo, p. i-xxiii-1-352. London, 1817. Pages 312-319.

Original edition.

HEARD, FRANKLIN FISKE. The legal acquirements of Shakespeare. Boston, 1865. Folio, p. viii, 65. Page 45.

"Leet," Ind. sc. 2, is explained. No reference to two other legal phrases, "third borough," Ind. sc. 1, and "to pass assurance of a dower in marriage." Act. iv, sc. 2.

HICKSON, SAMUEL. *Notes and Queries*. S. i, vol. i, 194, 227, 345.

These papers are in some sense the beginning of controversy as to the authorship and relationship of the two plays.

HUDSON, W. H. Shakespeare : his Life, Art and Characters. Boston : Ginn Bros., 1872. 12mo, vol. i, p. 474; vol. ii, p. 495. Page 33.

"I have no doubt that these five plays (of which *Taming of the Shrew* is one), were written before the time of Greene's death," 1592.

INGLEBY, CLEMENT MANSFIELD. Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse. Being materials for a history of opinion on Shakespeare and his works. A.D., 1591, 1693. Second edition, revised, with many additions, by Lucy Toulmin Smith. Published for the New Shakspeare Society. By Trübner & Co., London, E. C., 1879. Quarto, xxiii, 471. Pages 85, 157, 300, 307, 320.

Each of these references have been used in this bibliography. The list omits Sir J. Harington's reference to the *Taming of a Shrew*.

— Essays. Edited by his son. London : Trübner & Co., 1888. 12mo, p. vi (2), 327. Pages 2-3.

Refers to question of authorship.

JACKSON, Z. Shakespeare's Genius Justified. London, 1819, p. xvi-470. Page 112-130.

JACOB, DR. MARY PUTNAM. See *Studio*. New York, June, 1888.

JAHRBUCH DER DEUTCHEN SHAKESPEARE GESELLSCHAFT. 8vo, p. iv, 327, Weimar. Garrick's Bühnenbearbeitungen Shakespeare's, by Gisbert Freiheit Vincke.

— — Das Spanische Drama. Dritter Band (same), 1874. Page 435.

Draws a parallel between *Taming of the Shrew* and Lope da Vega's "El Caballero de Olmedo."

— — X, page 202, — König.

KLEIN, J. L. Shakespeare-Quellen in seiner "Geschichte des Dramas." IV. "Das Italienische Drama." Erster Band, 8vo, Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1866. Pages 337-346.

Draws a parallel between the episode of the Pedant and Vincentio in *Taming of the Shrew*, act. iv and v, and the like in Ariosto's, "Suppositi."

KNIGHT, CHARLES. Studies of Shakspeare, forming a companion to every edition of his text, by Charles Knight (motto). London: Charles Knight, Fleet Street, 1849. 8vo, viii-ii-I-560. Pages 36, 39-40, 138-147.

Places *Taming of the Shrew* in the first period, 1585-1593.

KYD, THOMAS. The Spanish Tragedy; or Hieronimo is mad again; containing the lamentable end of Don Horatio and Belimperia. With the pitiful death of Hieronimo. London, 1602.

Kyd's line "Go by, Jeronimo," is quoted, Ind., line 10. Frey.

LANGLIN, J. N. On Shakespeare's Provincialisms. SHAKESPEARIANA I, 183-188. Pages 186-187.

LATIMER, ELIZABETH WORMELEY. Familiar Talks on Some of Shakespeare's Comedies. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1886. 16mo; p. 8-445.

Gives a chapter to the *Taming of the Shrew*, "That outrageously extravagant play," as it is termed by SHAKESPEARIANA in the review of this book, III, 579-580.

LEO, F. A. Shakespeare Notes. London: Trübner & Co., 1885. 8vo, p. viii, 120.

Contains notes on twenty plays, of which one is *Taming of the Shrew*.

LESLIE, R. A., CHARLES ROBERT. *The Taming of the Shrew*. Act. iv, sc. 3; Act iv, sc. 3. Engraved by C. Rolls, Royal Gallery of British Art. London, n. d., J. Hogarth, 5 Haymarket. Elephant folio.

The first was printed for the "late Earl of Egremont;" the second was exhibited at the Royal Academy, 1832.

LITERARY WORLD, Boston, Mass. Vol. 18, p. 238 (July 23, 1887). "Curtis" in the *Taming of the Shrew*.

In *Shakespeareana*, edited by Mr. W. J. Rolfe. Points out that the text makes Curtis masculine, while Mr. Daly follows his predecessor in making it feminine.

— — Boston, Mass. Vol. 16, p. 142 (April, 18, 1885).

In *Shakespeareana*, edited by W. J. Rolfe, reference only.

MOFFATT, WM. D. See SHAKESPEARIANA, IV, 124. (Performances.)

NEW SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY TRANSACTIONS. First part. 8vo, p. 1-514; 1-75; 1-4. London, 1874. Page 85-125; also, pages 8, 12, 15, 31, 38, 43, 47, 50, 117. On the authorship of the *Taming of the Shrew*.

Authorship by Mr. F. G. Fleay, who combats Shakespearian authorship of play, and gives list of words used in this play only; long discussion follows.

— — — Part II, (1-3) xl p. 1-81-, 1-82. London, 8vo. 1877-9. Pages 162-169.

Time analysis in this series on this subject, by Mr. P. A. Daniel.

MORTON, H. G. Origin of the Induction to Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*. See Shakespeare Society Publications, II, 1.

NOTES AND QUERIES. London, 1840-1887. Small octavo, 62 vols.

The following references occur in the first six series, the references being to series, volume, and page, in ordinal number, Roman and Arabic numerals respectively:—
Two Plays, First, I, 194, 227, 345.

Induction. Christopher Sly, Second, XII, 266.

Scene i, "Embossed," Fourth, I, 454, 543; XI, 210, 321, 349, 391, 507; XII, 29, 117, 178, 219, 297.

Scene ii, "Sheer Ale," First, VIII, 168, 345.

Act I, Scene i, "Aristotle's checks," First, VII, 451, 496. Fourth, X, 369.

Act I, Scene ii, "Fear boys with bugs," First, VIII, 95, 97, 98.

Act I, Scene ii, "Balk logic," Fourth, IV, 322, 432, 487, 539.

Act I, Scene ii, "Baccare," Second, VII, 124, 527.

Act II, Scene i, "Studying at Rheims," Sixth, X, 7.

Act III, Scene ii, "To mose in the chine," Third, II, 502.

Act IV, Scene i, "Soud, soud," First, V, 152. Second, VII, 124.

Act IV, Scene ii, "An ancient . . . father," First, VIII, 35, 74.

Act IV, Scene iv, "Me shall you find willing," Third, XII, 61.

Act V, Scene ii, "An awful rule," First, VIII, 52.

Epilogue, Fifth, IX, 342.

PALL MALL BUDGET. London, 1888, June 14, p. 24. *The Taming of the Shrew*. Miss Horatio Ribbons.

"In the future I hope all men and women who respect one another will boycott *The Taming of the Shrew* until it is driven off the boards."

PERRING, SIR PHILIP. Hard Knots in Shakespeare. Second edition. Enlarged. Longman & Co., 1886. 8vo, p. 492.

New matter contains notes on the six plays not in first edition (1885), one of which is *The Taming of the Shrew*.

POTT, MRS. HENRY. Notes on Horticulture. SHAKESPEARIANA, II, pages 173-181, 241, 254.

Cites 246, "Sweet as morning roses," II, i, 174 and 250, "Why here's no crab," II, i, 231.

PYE, HENRY JAMES. Comments on the Commentators of Shakespeare. London, 1807. 8vo, i-xvi, 1-342. Pages 107-110.

STATIONERS' COMPANY, REGISTER OF THE. May 2, 1594. Secundo die Maij. Peter Shorte entred vnto him for his copie vnder master warden Cawoodes hand a booke intituled *a plesant conceyted hystorie called the Tayminge of a Shrowe*.

This is the entry made by Peter Short, and the first reference to the existence of the Play. I copy from Mr. Frey's citation, *Bankside*, II, 14.

RIBBONSON, MISS HORATIO. See *Pall Mall Budget*. London, 1888, June 14. *The Taming of the Shrew*.

RICHARDSON, ABBY SAGE. See *Galaxy*, July, '70, Jan., '71, Dec., '71. Shakespeare as a Plagiarist.

ROWLANDS, SAMUEL. Whole Crew of Kind Gossips. London? 1609. Reprint Hunterian Club, 1876. Page 33.

"The chieftest art I have I will bestow.

About a worke cald taming of the Shrow."

"A crew of Kind London Gossips," London, 1603, is given by W. C. Hazlitt, *Notes and Collections*, 1876, p. 365.

SARCEY, FRANCISQUE. See *Temps*, Sept. 10, 1888. Performances.

SARDOU, VICTORIEN. See *Times*, New York, Sept. 30, 1888.

SCHLEGEL, AUGUSTUS WILLIAM. A course of lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature, etc. London, Henry G. Bohn, 1861, 8vo, p. 535. Pages 380-382.

SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY PUBLICATIONS. Vol. II. London, 1845. 8vo, i, viii, 165, Article I, Pages 1-8. Origin of the Induction to Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, by H. G. Norton.

Gives a fragment, date unknown.

— London. Printed for the Shakespeare Society, 1852. 8vo, p: i, xxvi, 512. Notes and Emendations to the Text of Shakespeare's Plays, etc., by J. Payne Collier. Pages 141-154.

— London, 1846. Printed for the Shakespeare Society. i, xl. Memoirs of the Play Actors in the Plays of Shakespeare, by J. Payne Collier.

— Vol. I, 8vo, v, viii, 112. Pages 80-82. London, 1844. Art. XIV, Ballad illustrative of a passage in *The Taming of the Shrew*.

The passage—"We will be married o' Sunday."

SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY. The Papers of the Shakespeare Society.

— London, 1853, Vol. I, viii, 112, 1844; Vol. II, viii, 165, 1845; Vol. III, viii, 181, 1847; Vol. IV, viii, 158, 1849.

This contains: Vol. I. Pages 80-82. "I am to be married o' Sunday." Ballad illustrative of a passage in the *Taming of the Shrew*, by F. S. A.

Vol. II. Pages 1-8. Origin of the Induction to Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, by H. G. Norton.

The collation of these papers as finally collected is:—

Vol. III. Collier's Memoirs of the Play Actors.

Vol. IV. Pages 140-142. Beaumont and Fletcher's *Tamer Tamed*; the day when it was acted, and the Prologue and Epilogue spoken. By H. G. Norton.

The day was June 4, 1600.

SHAKESPEARIANA. Philadelphia: Leonard Scott Publication Co., 501 Chestnut street, n. d. (Nov., 1883, to Oct., 1884), quarto, (2) 322, vi. Pages 54, 132, 136, 186, 187, 279, vi.

— — Volume II. (Motto). Philadelphia: Leonard Scott Publication Co. 1885. 8vo, p. (4), 600, vii (1). Pages 213, 235, 239, 240, 246, 250, 307, 375-6, vii.

— — Volume III. (Motto). Philadelphia: Leonard Scott Publication Co. 1886. 8vo, p. (2), 592, viii. Pages 17, 36, 43, 328, 420, 530, 579, viii (86-7, performance of Goetz' Opera, Jan., 1885).

— — Vol. IV. (Motto). Philadelphia: Leonard Scott Publication Co. 1887. 8vo, p. (2), 584. Pages 75, 117, 124, 210, 211, 584.

The references in the four volumes of SHAKESPEARIANA which cite particular passage or deal with a special phase of the play, are arranged below by acts, the reference to the *Taming of the Shrew* succeeded by one to SHAKESPEARIANA.

Induction. III, 17. Records prove the country tinker of the *Taming of the Shrew* to have been a character well known by name.

I, 1, 1; 1, 279, University of Padua.

I, 1, 40; II, 307, "In brief, sir, study what you most affect," motto N. Y. Shakespeare Society, May 5, 1885.

I, 1, 92; II, 239, "School masters will I help," etc., to show "much space devoted to schoolmasters, although there is no schoolmaster in the play."

I, 1, 167; IV, 210. "In the *Taming of the Shrew* we have a passage from Terence, quoted in the form in which it appears in that grammar (Lilly's), 'Redime te captum quam queas minimo'; the original Latin being 'Quid agas, nisi ut te redimas captum,'" etc.

I, II, 11; I, 132. "Knock me at their gate, and rap me well." Negro Parallelism.

I, II, 95; I, 240. Hortensio's speech also cited as reference to schoolmasters.

II, I, 231; II, 250. "Why, here's no crab, and therefore look not sour."

II, I, 173; II, 246. "Sweet as morning roses, newly washed in dew."

III, II, 149; IV, 211. Gremio, in the *Taming of the Shrew*, when asked if he has come from the church, "As willingly as ere I came from school."

IV, I, 143; I, 54. Petruchio quotes Dame Beauty's reply to "Where is the life that late I lead?" as Pistol, 2 *Henry IV*: V, III, 147.

IV, III, 57; I, 186. Bravery — Finery.

V, II, 180; I, 187. Wench — young maid.

III, I, 18; II, 235. "I am no breeching scholar in the schools," etc.

STOKES, HENRY PAINE. An attempt to determine the Chronological order of Shakespeare's Plays. The Harness Essay. 1871. London, Macmillan & Co. 1878. 12mo, p. 220. Pages 33-39 and pages 183-4. *The Taming of the Shrew*.

Reviewing editions and changes of copyright by Burby, Ling, and Smethwicke, concludes that "as far back as May, 1594, *The Taming of a Shrew* was believed to be Shakespeare's in some sense." No one but Pope has attributed all this to Shakespeare, so he must have edited an older play. Rival theatres were in possession of the subject, hence the quarto of 1594, "acted by the Earle of Pembroke his servants." Shakespeare perhaps first revised it before 1594, but "subsequently on several occasions retouched it." Summarizes previous opinions. Page 183, gives copyright entries.

STUDIO. New York, June, 1888. Vol. III, No. 7, pp. 113-116. *Katharina and Petruchio*, by Dr. Mary Putnam Jacobi.

"In Petruchio's treatment of Katharina, Shakespeare's universal knowledge anticipates by three hundred years the effective prescriptions of Charcot and Weir Mitchell." The entire paper is one of the most original which has been written on the play.

SWINBURNE, ALGERNON CHARLES. A Study of Shakespeare. New York, 1880. 12mo, p. 319. Pages 25, 117.

TEMPLE BAR. London (July, 1872), Vol. XXXV. Pages 539-549. *Taming of the Shrew*.

THOM, WILLIAM TAYLOR. Some Parallelisms between Shakespeare's English and the Negro English of the United States. See SHAKESPEARIANA, I, 129-135. Page 132.

THURSTON, ——. Illustrations of Shakespeare from 230 vignette engravings by Thompson from designs by Thurston. London, 1826, n. p.

A sheet of six vignettes is devoted to *Taming of the Shrew*. Very queer.

TIMES, New York. 1888, Sept. 30. Page 10, col. 5. "Sardou and Mr. Daly."

Contains a letter in which M. V. Sardou expresses the opinion that Miss Rehan and Mr. Drew "might modify the fierceness of the scene between Petruchio and Katharine. Shakespeare does not shine by the delicacy of his works; he is brutal and coarse—as his public was—even in Romeo."

ULRICI, HERMANN. Shakespeare's Dramatic Art and his relation to Calderon and Goethe. 8vo, p. (1), xv (1), p. 1-554. Pages 69 and 293-299.

VINCKE, GISEBERT FREIHEIT. See Jahrbuch der Deutschen Gesellschaft, 1878.

WARTON. History of English Poetry.

Contains reference to a collection of comic stories by Richard Edwards, dated 1570, which included one dealing with the incidents of the Induction.

WATERS, ROBERT. William Shakespeare Portrayed by Himself. . . . New York, Worthington Company, 1888. 12mo, p. (2), iv, 347. Pages 216-222.

Quotes from Charles Armitage Brown and Dr. Maginn proofs of a trip to Italy in the *Taming of the Shrew*.

WHITE, RICHARD GRANT. Shakespeare's Scholar. Being historical and critical studies of his text characters and commentators, with an examination of Mr. Collier's folio of 1832. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1854. 8vo, xliii, p. 504. Pages 263-266.

Gives references to "pheeze," "Aristotle's checks," "balk logic," "an ancient angel" and "know best."

WILLIAMS, TALCOTT. See *Press*. Philadelphia, May 10, 1888. (Performances.)

WINTER, WILLIAM. *Tribune*, New York, Sept. 2, 1888, p. 12, col. 4.

London letter giving Miss Ada Rehan's reception in London.

— — See *Tribune*, Jan. 19, 1888. (Performances.)

— — See *Tribune*, Sept. 4, 1888.

ZUPITZA, JULIUS. *Scholars, Schools, and Schooling*. I, 277, 279. Page 279. *Shakespeariana*, II. Pages 233-241.

Rewritten and adapted from the article read before the German Shakespeare Society, by Isidore Schwab. Quotes from *Taming of the Shrew*. Pages 235, 239, 240.

— — A most pleasant and merrie new Comedie, intituled A Knacke to Know a Knave. London, 1594.

Contains the line:—

"My house? Why, 'tis my goods, my wyle, my land, my horse, my ass or anything that is his."

— — Annotations illustrative of the plays of Shakespeare, by Johnson, Steevens, Malone, etc., etc. 12mo; 2 vols.; no pagination. A signature, 12 pp., is devoted to *Taming of the Shrew*.

Published with Scholey's edition. The author is not given in Halkett and Laing's Dictionary of Pseudonyms.

— — "I am to be married o' Sunday," a ballad illustrative of a passage in the *Taming of a Shrew*. By F. S. A. Papers of the Shakespeare Society, 1844, p. 80.

—Mr. Albert Frey cites the following authors in the *Bankside Shakespeare*, the full titles of whose works did not come in my way. He gives no reference by page: Lloyd, Herand, Hall, Tieck, Farmer, Ward.

PERFORMANCES.

HENSLOWE, PHILIP. *Diary* edited by J. Payne Collier, Shakespeare Society, 1841.

Conlombe Omersby, 1594. "June 11, Rd. at the *Tamyng of a Shrowe*. IXd."

MALONE, EDMOND. *Historical Account of the English Stage*. Vol. III. Page 233.

"On Friday night, at St. James, 26th of November, 1633, was acted before the King and Queene, *The Taming of the Shrew*. Lik't." Sir Henry Herbert's Office Book.

PEPY'S, SAMUEL, *Diary and Correspondence of*. With a life and notes by Richard, Lord Braybrooke. In 4 vols. First American from fifth London edition. Phila., 1855. Vol. I. Pages 155, 204. Vol. III. Pages 103, 296.

"1660, Oct. 30. I went to the Cockpit, all alone, and there saw a very fine play, called *The Tamer Tamed*, very well acted.

"July 31. In the afternoon, I went to the Theatre, and there I saw *The Tamer Tamed* well done.

"1667, July 9. To the King's House, and there saw *The Taming of the Shrew*, which hath some very good pieces in it; but generally is but a mean play, and the best part, Sawny, done by Lacy, and hath not half its life, by reason of the words I suppose not being understood, at least by me.

"Nov. 1. To the King's playhouse, and there saw a silly play, and an old one, *The Taming of a Shrew*."

The plays seen by Pepys were in both instances adaptations, one by Fletcher and the other by Lacy.

HISTORICAL MSS. COMMISSION (British). Vol. I, p. 49.

"Collection of Lord de Tabley, containing Epilogue to *Taming of the Shrew*, acted at Nether Tabley by the servants and neighbors there at Christmas, 1671, P. L."

GENEST, JOHN. Some Account of the English Stage from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830. Bath: H. E. Carrington, 1832. 8vo, 10 vols. V, 632; VI, 607; VII, 732; VIII, 704; IX, 600.

A part of the references to *Taming of the Shrew* in this work are—each being stated more at length in its chronological place below—as follows: IV, 446, 451; V, 97, 173, 287, 355; VI, 477; VII, 305, 210, 320, 379, 441, 447; VIII, 471; IX, 9.

V, 355. April 1, 1773. Drury Lane. Dodd's benefit. *Twelfth Night* . . . with *Catharine and Petruchio*. Petruchio, Dodd, first time; Grumio, Baddesley; Catharine, Miss Pope.

VI, 477. "Mar. 13, 1778. Drury Lane. Kemble's benefit. *Jane Shore* . . . with *Catharine and Petruchio*. Petruchio, Kemble; Grumio, Baddesley; Catharine (for that night only), Mrs. Siddons. Kemble played Petruchio very well. Mrs. Siddons acted with spirit, but did not seem at home in the character."

VII, 210. March 16, 1795. Covent Garden. Mrs. Pope's benefit. "With *Catharine and Petruchio*. Petruchio, Lewis; Grumio, Quick; Catharine (for that night only), Mrs. Pope.

VII, 305. Nov. 21, 1796. Covent Garden. Petruchio, Lewis; Grumio, Munder; Catharine, Miss Wallis, first time.

VII, 371. June 13, 1797. Haymarket. "After which *Catharine and Petruchio*, by Palmer and Mrs. Gibbs."

VII, 441. May 18, 1799. "After which (*Iron Chest*. Fitzharding, Johnson, from New York, first appearance), *Catharine and Petruchio*. Catharine (for that night only), Mrs. Johnson."

VIII, 471. 1798-9. Drury Lane. John Barmister's character, Petruchio.

IV, 446. Jan. 21, 1756. *Winter's Tale* and *Catharine and Petruchio* were acted together twelve times by Garrick.

IV, 451. Feb. 23, 1756. *Catharine and Petruchio* repeated.

V, 97. May 2, 1768. Drury Lane. "For benefit of Quick and three others. *Hamlet* with *Catharine and Petruchio*. Quick played First Grave-digger and the Taylor."

V, 173. May 23, 1768. Drury Lane. "Romeo and Juliet with *Catharine and Petruchio*, by Mrs. Abington and (Thomas) King; Grumio, (Richard) Yates."

VII, 379. 1769-70. Covent Garden. Quick's character, Taylor, in *Catharine and Petruchio*.

V, 287. May 22, 1770. Covent Garden. *Catharine and Petruchio*. Catharine, Miss Lewis.

IX, 9. 1798-9. Drury Lane. Mrs. Charles Kemble's character, Catharine, in *Katharine and Petruchio*.

ATHENÆUM. London. 1844, p. 275, No. 856, March 23.

Notice of the performance of the *Taming of the Shrew* at the Haymarket in 1844, in the series of revivals of Shakespeare in the manner of the theatre of the sixteenth century. Mr. Webster as Petruchio, Miss Nisbett as Katharine.

— — London. 1847. Page 1132. No. 1044.

Notice of the performance at the Haymarket, Oct. 26, 1847, of *The Taming of the Shrew*, "from the original text." Mr. Webster, Petruchio; Mrs. Nisbett, Catharine.

— — London. 1848. Page 1083. No. 1066. Oct. 28, 1848.

Notice of Mrs. Stirling's performance in "Shakespeare's more celebrated *Kate the Cursed*, Oct., 1848, at the Olympic, Mr. F. Vinling as Petruchio." This appears to have been Garrick's version.

— — London. 1856. Page 1439. No. 1517. Nov. 22, 1856.

Notice of the performance at Sadler's Wells of the *Taming of the Shrew* on Nov. 15, 1856; account of the management of the Induction.

— — London. 1864. Page 585. No. 1904. April 23, 1864.

Notice of the performance at the Olympic, on April 23, after the *Ticket of Leave Man*, of the *Taming of the Shrew*. H. Neville, Petruchio; Mrs. Hughes, Catharine. This was a tercentenary celebration; but Garrick's version was used.

— — London. 1881. Page 438. No. 2787. March 26, 1881.

Notice of Mr. Edwin Booth's performance of *Katharine and Petruchio* at the Princess's Theatre, London. "In his extravagant costume, Mr. Booth seems to have drawn some ideas from the North American Indians." "The version played is marred by such absurdities as Mr. Booth, if he wishes to keep the reputation in England of a Shakespeare scholar, must at once excise." This is Mr. Winter's version, "the text with a few trifling exceptions, that of Shakespeare."

— — London. 1885. Page 736. No. 3006. June 6, 1885.

Notice of the performance of *Katharine and Petruchio* at a revival following a recent previous presentation. Reviews business of revival at Haymarket, London, June, 1885. Mrs. Bernard Beere, Catharine, and Mr. Forbes Robertson, Petruchio. Notes improvement on previous performance through the omission of "farceful adjuncts."

CLARKE, ASIA BOOTH. *The Elder and the Younger Booth*. Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co., 1882. 12mo, p. 104. Pages 143, 153, 166, 178.

"E. Booth (Edwin) now joined a company of eight or ten persons to go through the mining towns." The standard bill with this company was *The Iron Chest and Katharine and Petruchio*. This was in 1854.

"Miss Charlotte Cushman and Edwin Booth gave ten performances at the Academy of Music, Philadelphia, commencing Dec. 31, 1860," one of which was *Katharine and Petruchio*.

Same play in his "re-appearance on the Philadelphia Stage to commemorate the anniversary of the birth and death of Shakespeare," April 23, 1866. At the new Princess's Theatre, London, Nov. 6, 1880.

MORLEY, HENRY. *The Journal of a London Play-goer, from 1851 to 1866*. London, 1866. 12mo, p. —. Page 159-161 (Dec. 6, 1856), page 339 (May 16, 1864).

Mr. Phelps as Sly in the full play. Mr. Neville as Petruchio in Garrick's version.

SHAKESPEARIANA. Philadelphia, 1886. III, 328.

In German theatres, in 1885, Herr Arnlim Wecksung reports seventy-one performances, by forty-nine companies, of the *Taming of the Shrew*; *Hamlet*, one hundred and three times, by fifty-six companies; only one plays performed oftener.

— — Philadelphia, 1887. IV. Pages 124-126. *The Taming of the Shrew*. W. D. M.

A notice of Mr. Daly's performance.

— — Philadelphia, 1886. III, 43.

Edwin Booth, Nov. 28, 1886, Brooklyn, N. Y. *Hamlet* and *Catharine and Petruchio*.

SUN, New York, 1886, Jan. 5, page 1, 6½ cols.

This was a report of the opening night of the American Opera, at which Goetz' opera of the *Taming of the Shrew* was presented. Theodore Thomas, conductor; Pauline L'Allemand, Catharine, and William H. Lee, Petruchio. The performance was given in the Academy of Music.

HERALD, New York, 1886, Jan. 5, page 5, 8½ cols.

The full cast and a plan of the house, with those present, will be found in this report.

— — New York, 1888, March 22, p. 6, col. 7. "Much Fun in I. Co."

See *Times*, New York, March 22.

— — New York, 1888, May 30, page 7, col. 2. "Daly's Company in London."

A cable despatch dated London, May 29th, giving a report of the production of the *Taming of the Shrew* at the Gaiety Theatre by Mr. Daly's company.

— — New York, 1888, Sept. 4, page 5, 3 cols. "Daly in Paris."

Cable giving particulars of performance.

TIMES, New York, 1887, Jan. 19, page 1, 5th col.

Notice of first performance of Mr. Augustin Daly's revival of the *Taming of the Shrew*, Jan. 18, 1887, with brief résumé of previous productions.

— — New York, 1888, March 26, p. 12, col. 8. "Katherine in our Time."

Gives an account of a travesty of the *Taming of the Shrew*, to be performed by Co. 1, 7th Reg. N. G. S. N. J., April 6, 1888, at the Metropolitan Opera House, for the benefit of the Hahnemann Hospital.

— — New York, 1887, August 31, p. 8, col. 1. "Mr. Daly and his Players."

Interview with Mr. Daly on his tour. "The *Taming of the Shrew* was received well everywhere; but most enthusiastically in Boston, Philadelphia and San Francisco. In Chicago it was not so cordially appreciated. . . . The *Taming of the Shrew* was in contemplation two years before I presented it."

— — New York, 1888, September 16, p. 4, col. 5. "French Critics and Mr. Daly."

Gives summary of the impression made by play as well as players in the Paris performance.

TRIBUNE, New York, 1887, Jan. 19, p. 4, 6th col.

Notice of first performance of Mr. Augustin Daly's revival of the *Taming of the Shrew*, Jan. 18, 1887, by William Winter. This notice is quoted in SHAKESPEARIANA, IV, 75.

— — — New York, 1888, Sept. 4, p. 4, col. 6. "Mr. Daly's success in the Gay Capital."

Cable from William Winter.

INQUIRER, Philadelphia, 1887, May 10, p. 8, col. 1.

Notice of first performance in Philadelphia, Chestnut Street Opera House, of Mr. Augustin Daly's revival, by L. Clarke Davis.

PRESS, Philadelphia, 1887, May 10, 4th page, 5th col.

Notice of first performance in Philadelphia, Chestnut Street Opera House, of Mr. Augustin Daly's revival, by Talcott Williams.

ADVERTISER, Boston Daily. 1887, May 24th, p. 4, col. 5. "*The Taming of the Shrew*, performed by Mr. Daly's Company," by H. A. Clapp.

Notice of the first performance at the Boston Museum, about one-half the notice being devoted to a careful summary of the questions of authorship, *motto* and position of the work as a play.

TIMES, London. 1888, May 30, p. 9, col. 7.

Notice of the performance at the Gaiety Theatre, May 29, by Mr. Daly's company. The first third of the notice reviews the history of the play. At close, the writer says that: "The play is mounted with perfect taste, and with at least as much archaeological correctness as an intelligent public requires. In the banqueting scene, upon which the curtain falls, a glee party sing 'Should she upbraid' to Bishop's well-known music. Archaeologists may be horrified at this defiance of their theories, but the effect is pretty and we will add appropriate in the extreme." The "Induction"—which is termed the "Introduction" by the learned critic—is discussed at length, with the conclusion that "It is still open to the spectator to hold, with Garrick, that, in the circumstances, it is not worth while to introduce such a prelude at all." As a whole, the effect of the performance shows that "*the Taming of the Shrew* has received but scant justice from its professional interpreters."

PALL MALL BUDGET, London, 1888, June 7, page 12. "*The Taming of the Shrew*."

A report of the performance at the Gaiety Theatre, London, June 5th, with illustrations, by Mr. Daly's company.

— — — London, 1888, Sept. 6, pp. 28-29. "*The Taming of the Shrew* in Paris."

Quotes the French actor, M. Coquelin, as saying "Nous autres, nous pouvons pas comprendre ces rudesses là."

TRUTH, London, 1888, June 7, page 986. "*The Taming of the Shrew*."

"Mark how inconsistent are these same critics, who compliment Mr. Augustin Daly and Mr. William Winter on restoring the original text. . . . But wherever the American version differs from the Garrick farce the critics shake their heads over it."

TEMPS, Paris, 1888, Sept. 10, page 1. (Feuilleton) Chronique Theatrale.
Representation d'une troupe americaine au Vaudeville; la *Megère*
apprivoisée, de Shakespeare par Francisque Sarcey.

Je ne sais, mais quelque chose se révolte en moi à les brutalités; elles me navrent et ne amusent pas. . . . Nous nous plaisons à voir l'homme aux mains de la femme qui en fait son jouet, comme Céliamène s'amuse d'Alceste; les Anglais préfèrent la voir maltraitée par son seigneur et maître. Chaque peuple, comme dirait l'autre, a ses idées et ses usages.

Open Court.

That's a question; how shall we try it?

—*The Comedy of Errors*, V, 1, 421.

In this I'll be impartial; be you judge

Of your own cause.

—*Measure for Measure*, V, 1, 166.

HANGING A WOLF—A NEW GREEK SHAKESPEARE.

In the August number of SHAKESPEARIANA, Dr. Furness, in his usual delightful and inimitable way, calls attention to the fact, that, in *The Merchant of Venice*, Shakespeare is entirely right when he makes Gratiano say to Shylock:—

"Thy currish spirit

Govern'd a wolf who hanged for human slaughter

Even from the gallows did his fell soul fleet."

The passage is of singular interest to the student of the English past, and repeats one of the allusions of our most ancient poetry.

There is abundant testimony, beyond the instance cited by Dr. Furness, to prove that a wild beast might expiate upon the gallows the crimes done in his days of nature. Indeed, in Switzerland quite recently a beast was tried and executed, while in the fourteenth century mediæval law punished with death a horse or hog found trespassing on a neighbor's preserves, and throughout German and English antiquity it was not uncommon to try and to sentence a wolf or fox for destroying crops or human life.

The origin and explanation of this curious custom, so familiar in Old England and everywhere among the Teutonic folk, may be clearly

seen in several interesting passages of our oldest English poem, the vigorous and vivid epic of *Beowulf*.

For instance, after the monster Grendel, "the enemy of God," has invaded the pleasure hall of King Hrothgar and devoured thirty warriors for his horrid meal, and for twelve winters has made of Heorot a place of terror, the poet says:—

"Sibbe ne wolde
With manna hwone mægenes Deniga
Feorh-bealo feorran feo thingian."

or, in later English, [Grendel] "would not have peace of any of the race of the Danes, neither remove the mortal-bane, (Lebensübel) nor compound it with money."

Sib has in Anglo-Saxon the meaning both of peace and of relationship, but in the latter sense it was not so restricted in its application as the modern *Sippe* or *Sippschaft*. The important fact is, that, according to the old German conception, the bonds of *Sib* or *Sippe* extended beyond the human race, and included much of the subordinate creation. In the passage I have quoted, the *Sippe* is extended to Grendel and the last line must be interpreted that if he had *paid* for the thirty men whom he slew he could have been readmitted to human society. By Germanic law every man had his price from the king down, and he who took another's life had either to buy off retaliation by payment of the sum fixed by law or to become an exile (*wrāca*). Now, as the orders of inferior creation were included in the human *Sippe* they were subject to the same laws and punishments, and a wolf, therefore, to return to the Shakespearian instance, would be entitled to the same right of trial, and would receive in similar way, if unable to satisfy the law, like punishment with men.

Deep and broad is the wisdom of Shakespeare.

Apropos of Mr. Thimm's recent article on "Shakespeare in the British Museum," (September SHAKESPEARIANA) pray allow me to do justice to one faithful and intelligent student and translator of Shakespeare whose name is not yet known as it should be to the western world. Enumerating the foreign versions of Shakespeare, Mr. Thimm says, "The Greeks began to translate *Hamlet* in 1858, and

they are now publishing the entire works in a very worthy translation by Bikela, five volumes of which have already appeared." This is true enough, but there is also another translation into modern Greek far better and more important. It is that made by Michel N. Damiralis, secretary of the National Bank of Greece. I had an excellent opportunity in Athens to compare his work with the other fragmentary Romaic translations. Hardly may one find in the half-dozen plays already translated by M. Damiralis a single misconception of the Shakespearian meaning, while such misconceptions are frequent and often gross in the edition referred to by Mr. Thimm. Damiralis is now working hard on his translation of *Hamlet*, following with care Dr. Furness's superb Variorum.

I shall not forget how, with eager enthusiasm and in mingled Greek and English, as we walked by the blue waters of the Gulf, and watched the purple sun fading on Hymethus, this earnest student of our master-poet talked of the new Greek literature and the great part which Shakespeare has to play in it.

ALBERT H. SMYTH.

September 1888.

Shakespeare Societies.

Such a holy witch
That he enchants societies into him;
Half all men's hearts are his.

Cymbeline, I, vi, 166.

CLIFTON SHAKSPERE SOCIETY.—Session '87-'88. [Report continued from October SHAKESPEARIANA.] *March 24*: Mrs. C. I. Spencer, president, in the chair.—The Rev. H. P. Stokes sent some "Notes on John Marston," calling attention to the confusion as to his personal history, to the feuds between him and Ben Jonson, to the ecclesiastical censure passed upon him by Whitgift and Bancroft, to Henslowe's description of him in 1599 as "the new poete," to the allusions to him in *Skialetheia* and in *The Return from Parnassus*, etc.—Some "Notes on

Antonio and Mellida were sent by Miss Emma Phipson, who said that the play is not much more than a series of episodes and intrigues, for the most part highly improbable, enacted by a set of persons who have little besides their names to identify them. The language is strained and affected; pompous, harsh-sounding words mar the smoothness of the lines, and scraps of learning are brought in with no other purpose than to show the author's erudition. As Marston's mother was an Italian, perhaps the sudden breaking out into that language of several of the characters was not so affected as it seems, but it must have tried the patience of his English-speaking audience. Marston is specially happy in his descriptions of natural phenomena, though in some of his expressions we may trace the influence of Chapman; but his heroes and heroines possess little individuality. Marston, whose satires were keenly felt, might himself have sat to Shakespeare for the portrait of Jaques. *Mellida* is chiefly the sport of circumstances. *Rosaline*, who has been said to be a weak imitation of *Beatrice*, is really more like *Nerissa*. Some passages in the play which we might hastily call plagiarisms were, if our dates be correct, written before their supposed patterns.—Mr. S. E. Bengough read a paper entitled "The Dramatic Defects of *Antonio and Mellida*," saying that it was difficult to fix a standard of excellence by which dramatic works may be tested, seeing that they vary from a Greek tragedy to a Christmas pantomime. With all the differences that exist between the subjects of Elizabeth and Victoria, there is yet such a community of moral and intellectual nature between them that the works bearing the name of Shakespeare appeal powerfully to both. Here, then, is a standard of dramatic excellence by which to test the work of other play-writers. Guided by this we expect (1) that the plot or action of a drama shall possess unity and interest, (2) that its characterization shall be natural and consistent, (3) that its thoughts and sentiments shall be fresh and striking, and (4) that the expression shall be on a higher level than ordinary converse, either ideally beautiful or else distinguished by attractiveness of wit and humor. Painful experience, however, tells us that in other authors we look in vain for all these; and, if we find a high degree of excellence in one of these departments, we are will-

ing to be blind to shortcomings in the others. *Antonio and Mellida* fails to come up to our test in any of the respects mentioned. The most that can be said of it is that here and there is a flash of genius ; but, in order that one may be gratified with it, one has to suffer one's good taste to be perpetually shocked by insipid coarseness, gross sensuality, and extravagant bombast. The unequal character of the play is so remarkable that it makes one think that more than one hand was employed upon it. In some of the later scenes there are vigorous and subtle thoughts expressed in a garb of metaphor that reminds one now and then of the great master himself.—Mr. L. M. Griffiths read a paper called "The Story of *Antonio and Mellida*, and some of its Shaksperianisms." He directed attention to the similarity between many of its incidents and those in Shakespeare. The resemblances of character are most marked. In much detail it was shown that there are strong likenesses between many of the characters in the play and some of Shakespeare's well-known people. There is no need to accuse Marston of copying from Shakespeare in the characterization. Most of the *dramatis personæ* are portraits of men and women common enough in Elizabethan times, and in their representation by two shrewd observers there would, of course, be much alike.

April 14: Mrs. C. I. Spencer, President, in the chair.—In a paper on "The Poems of Shakspeare," Mr. G. Munro Smith said that, as in Shakespeare's own time his poems were popular and now they are little cared for, the question arises whether the people of the Elizabethan or of the Victorian age are to be considered the better judges. The power of describing scenery is now much greater than in Shakespeare's time. Also, for nearly three centuries we have had bequeathed to us poetry which universal testimony has declared to be of supreme excellence. And appreciation grows with knowledge. On the other hand, the advance of science and the exact methods of thought it inculcates tends to destroy the imagination and spoil the poetic taste. Yet weighing the gain against the loss, the verdict must be that we are more qualified to pass judgment on Shakespeare's poems than his contemporaries or those who immediately followed him, and that our neglect of the poems (leaving the sonnets for the

present out of the question) may thus be justified.—Mr. S. E. Bengough read a paper, entitled “The Music of Language as illustrated by *Venus and Adonis*,” in which he said that the elementary sounds of language are an undeveloped music; and, after dwelling in detail on the differences between the various vowel-sounds which had been ascertained to have towards one another an invariable ratio of vibrations, went on to show that to the cultivated English ear there is an association between certain sounds and certain ideas. Illustrations of this view were adduced in great numbers from the poem.—A paper by Mr. J. W. Mills on *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece* was read. *Lucrece* in style is a much riper production than *Venus and Adonis*. The blemish, however, of an inordinate, although popular, classicism is irreparable. There is also in it a frequent want of naturalness, and it is loaded with labored conceits.—Dr. J. N. Langley, in a paper on “A Few Obsolete Words in *Venus and Adonis*,” taking “ear” (to plough) as a text, dwelt mainly on the almost inexhaustible derivatives of the prolific root *ar*.

April 28: Mr. W. R. Etches in the chair.—Miss Louisa Mary Davies, in a paper entitled “First Impressions of the *Sonnets* of Shakspeare—December 31, 1609,” gave a view of the sonnets as they would have appeared to an elderly gentleman alive at the time of the publication of these much maligned poems, and by whom they were regarded simply as literary productions, no notice being taken of their supposed autobiographical or allegorical character. In the first place he would acknowledge his gratitude to the honored Earl of Surrey for bringing to our shores this graceful form of versification—three four-fold strands of poesy, caught up, and dexterously wound into a perfect circle by two shining threads of gold. Then he would dwell on the sympathetic quality of poetry as shown in these verses which had waked in him a hundred happy thoughts, just tinged with that sweet sadness that makes them seem realities and not dreams. We hardly know whether to bestow our chief admiration on the intellect that conceived them, on the poetic imagination that clothed them, or on the artist-skill that moulded the various lovely thoughts into one perfect whole. *Sonnets* lxvi., cxxix., cxlvi., are only instances where

profoundest sense and brilliant imagination are blended with an unsurpassable artistic terseness, and where the antitheses are remarkable alike for sharpness and accuracy. If no other proof offered of Master Shakespeare's glorious intellect as unveiled in his sonnets, it would surely be sufficient to point to a series beginning with xviii., and continuing with scarcely any intermission to lxxvii., which ring an indescribably graceful set of changes on the simplest and yet most complex of all themes—"I love you." At the first hearing we may fancy we detect duplicates, but a closer attention brings to our apprehension new and charming shades of difference, the more truly appreciated because they must be listened for. Truly his delicately-tinted love sonnets are like the closely-folded petals of the rose he so dearly loves, each one differing somewhat from its neighbor, each modestly enclosing its own choice beauty and fragrance, each necessary to the perfect whole, and all bending in homage toward their common centre. But marvellous as is the "body" of these poems, so also is our admiration called forth for their poetry and music—the two beautiful garments in which they are clothed. Nearly every line runs over with poetry and turns to music on the tongue. Some of the finest passages in the *Sonnets* are inspired by the observation of nature, for example, the whole of xxxiii. and lxxiii., and many passages scattered here and there. Music in poetry comprehends a great deal more than the liquid flow of syllables and the due adjustment of long and short vowels. To be perfect it requires also the harmony of sentiment and sound. This finds its absolute fulfilment in lxxi., in which the feeling and rhythm alike are eloquent of mournful self-abnegation. This perfect harmony of conception and form is observable in many others, notably in xxix., xxx., liv., lx., and lxxxvii.—Mr. S. E. Bengough read a paper on "The Use of Alliteration in Shakspeare's Poems." The predominance of alliteration forms a part of the very genius of our language; and while it gives force to the dialect of the rudest peasant, its artistic employment renders it capable, in the hand of the orator or poet, of marvels of expressiveness, infinitely various and often exquisitely delicate. It is astonishing that, in works on style in English literature and kindred subjects, its importance is so ignored.

It is commonly alluded to as a trick which is rather to be avoided than otherwise. Now, if the use of marked alliteration in almost every sentence is a blemish, all our greatest masters of prose style did not know how to write English. It was then pointed out that alliteration is useful in (1) giving rhythm and emphasis, (2) accentuating antithesis, (3) associating allied or related ideas, (4) emphasizing significant combinations of letters, (5) imparting effect to assonance; and examples of these were quoted from Shakespeare's poems and sonnets. Mr. W. R. Etches read a paper on "Shakspeare's Autobiography in the *Sonnets*." He said that the biographical materials we possess are so scanty and so much of the nature of conjecture that it is no wonder that we look eagerly to the *Sonnets* for biography, although that which they reveal may not coincide with our preconceived idea of the great man's life. While adopting the generally received view that the letters "W. H." stand for the name of William Herbert, there is a difficulty in believing that Shakespeare could have written such adulatory language to a man so weak, reckless, and mean, as Herbert. And although from a comparison of *Sonnets* xlii., lxx., lxxix., cxxxii., some reasons might be adduced for considering the "dark lady" as a dramatic device, yet from the flesh and blood likeness of all the descriptive sonnets, it is better to accept the personal interpretation; and the story of Mary Fitton in connection with Herbert renders the double identification most probable. With all the flattering words used towards Herbert, who stands, as it were, for Shakespeare's dramatic ideal, the poet does not hesitate to tell "the tenth muse" (!) very decidedly about his faults (xciv.-xcvi.). Altogether the conclusion is irresistible, that, in the *Sonnets*, Shakespeare is relating his own experience, although it is doubtful if he ever intended them for publication; and it is not likely that these are "the sugred sonnets" which Meres said Shakespeare had distributed "among his private friends," for to these that description is certainly not appropriate.—"A Member" sent a paper on "The Two Angels of *Sonnet* cxliv."

May 26: Miss Florence Herapath in the chair.—Miss Emma Phipson sent a paper on "Marston as a Dramatist." The few facts known about Marston's life were first noticed. His literary career

extended from 1598 to 1607, when he retired to prepare for clerical life. He was appointed to the living of Christ church. His mind underwent a great change. When he ceased to write, he lost his interest in worldly matters, and took no part in the re-publication of his works. He resigned his living in 1631, and died in 1634. His earliest writings—the Satires—gained him many enemies. In humor, he seems to be entirely wanting. His comedies sparkle with smart sayings, but have no hearty ring of mirth. When personal animosity guides the satirist's pen, his wit becomes jealous rancor and loses its charm. There are more poetical passages to be found in *Antonio and Mellida* than in Marston's other plays. Miss Phipson then gave an outline of several of the plays. *The Malcontent* was pronounced to be the most interesting, its language dignified and compact, and descriptions graphic. *The Dutch Courtesan* deserves notice chiefly for the sprightly dialogue, but it is too unrefined for modern taste. *Eastward Hoe*, written in conjunction with Chapman and Dekker, is valuable for the vivid insight it gives into the manners and customs of the Elizabethan age. *Parasitaster* is ingenious and amusing. *Sophonisba* is well-intentioned and not undramatic. Hazlitt considered Marston to have been even more of a freethinker than Marlowe, on account of his frequent and not unfavorable allusion to sceptical notions. But Marston is somewhat dogmatically theological in his expressions. He took a gloomy Calvinistic view of human nature. The fact that he gave up his literary career for a clerical life is a sufficient answer to such accusations of unorthodoxy. To his semi-Italian origin may be traced his fiery, impulsive temperament, his sharp wit, quick temper, readiness to take offence, delight in fierce and terrible incidents, as well as his frequent introduction of Italian phrase. His temper was apparently sardonic and slow to appreciate the "soul of goodness in things evil," which Shakespeare's most genial, all-loving nature ever recognized.—Mr. L. M. Griffiths read a paper on "Some Shaksperianisms in *Antonio's Revenge*." Such a play should not be judged from a nineteenth-century standpoint. When it was written the taste for horrors on the stage was strong; and it must also be borne in mind that the play was acted by the Children of

Paul's, whose audience consisted only of "gentlemen and scholars." This explains the frequent introduction of scraps of foreign languages. In its broader features *Antonio and Mellida* can be compared with *Romeo and Juliet*. *Antonio's Revenge* can, in like manner, be compared with *Hamlet*, for the incidents on which the plots of the two plays develop are similar, and many of the situations are much alike. Also many of the characters and much of the phraseology have a strong Shakespearian likeness. Marston's lighter style, which he freely exhibits in *Antonio and Mellida*, is here made subordinate to the tragic character of the play, which, apart from its few exquisitely pathetic passages, deserves careful study as an integral and representative development of the more finished drama as it left Shakespeare's hands. The closing scene, though; in quantity, it falls short of the slaughter at the end of *Hamlet*, makes up for it in quality, and altogether the scholarly audience in the school-room of St. Paul's, who had gone for a feast of horrors, must have felt that a rich treat had been given them. The Shakespearian resemblances of detail are not so many in this play as in the first part, which was rather a record of Marston's contemporary London life than a serious attempt, as this is, at a consistent tragedy where unity of action was steadfastly kept in view. So it comes to pass that, in this branch of dramatic work, Shakespeare had no difficulty in showing his marvellous pre-eminence, although he would, in the delineation of life and manners, be always closely run, and sometimes surpassed, by such keen satirists as Ben Jonson and Marston. But in the presentation of the more complex forms of human motive and human passion, Shakespeare's powers of expression transcend all efforts of other writers. Judged by the Shakespeare-standard, Marston's works must be pronounced failures. Yet it must be admitted that they have in detail a considerable amount of power, if not of beauty.—Mr. S. E. Bengough read a paper on "The Similes and Metaphors in *Antonio's Revenge*." Analysis of the metaphors here employed by Marston discovers almost every species of offence against good taste; but yet it must be granted that the reader is startled with occasional flashes of genius lightning up with a single phrase a whole region of thought. Grace

and beauty always involve a certain reserve of power. But Marston puts forth all his strength on every occasion. There seems to have been a vein of most outrageous coarseness in Marston's nature, and this was always near the surface.—This meeting brought to an end the society's thirteenth session. The work for next session is *As You Like It*, *A Woman killed with Kindness*, *Twelfth Night*, *Julius Cæsar*, *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, *Hamlet*, *Epicoene*.—The hon. secretary (9 Gordon-road, Clifton, Bristol), England, will be grateful for any magazine-articles, newspaper-scrap, or anything else to add to the society's library, which now consists of 319 volumes.

Miscellany.

To knit again

This scattered corn into one mutual sheaf.

—*Titus Andronicus*, V, iii 70.

GOWER'S STATUE OF SHAKESPEARE.—Mrs. De Courcy Laffan's lines, as Oscar Wilde recited them at the unveiling of the Gower statue, in Stratford-on-Avon, October 10th,—

“Hear royal Henry chide his self-crowned heir,
The guilty Queen moan for her white hands' stain,
Or Falstaff troll some roystering refrain,
Or Hamlet play with his own soul's despair.”

describe the four bronze figures of Prince Hal, Lady Macbeth, Falstaff, and Hamlet, which stand on projecting bases supporting the central figure—a life-size image of Shakespeare. The poet is represented seated, “in his habit as he lived,” the habit chosen being a doublet covered by a loose sleeveless gown such as he wears in the portrait shown at the Birthplace. His face, also, bears close resemblance to the same portrait, and the gaze of its eyes is directed toward the parish-church, where lie the bones his epitaph guards. The figure posing for Hamlet is seated, musing with melancholy face

over Yorick's skull. Falstaff sits, an empty wine cup is in the left hand, the right raised with the forefinger outstretched and gesturing forth some merry tale. Lady Macbeth is represented rubbing her hands to remove the indelible blood-stains. The face is hard and cruel, but a shadow of remorse broods over it. Prince Hal is trying on his father's crown. As Mr. Wilde,—whose office it was to propose the toast to the sculptor,—said :—

“Lord Ronald Gower had caught *le moment psychologique*, ‘the moment of artistic revelation’—the moment being taken when Hamlet most expressed himself—his philosophy, the learning he had as a scholar, the melancholy as a thinker, the love he had as one who had seen Ophelia—all those things were seen on the monument outside the building; or when Hal took his father's crown, forgetting the King lying on the bed, filled, himself, with the pride of new royalty; or when Lady Macbeth wiped from her hands the blood of Duncan; or when Falstaff was indulging in that eternal laughter which time has not been able to dull, but which still came to us across the centuries and served to remind us that if Shakespeare had enough sadness to conceive the melancholy Prince of Denmark, he also had that healthy English enjoyment which enabled him to make the jests of Falstaff still beautiful to us.”

The memorial is decorated with four laurel chaplets and masks typical of comedy and tragedy, and is based upon a carved pedestal sixteen feet in height, made of stone from the same Warwickshire quarry as that of which the memorial is built. It stands on the grounds surrounding the Memorial Building, and was the subject of a very well-conducted ceremony on the day of its dedication to the town and memory of Shakespeare. There were many visitors from London and the large provincial cities, and a multitude from within a radius of twenty miles. The monument was gracefully unveiled, amid cheers and music, by Lady Hodgson, wife of the Mayor of the city, who is a daughter of the Chief Justice of New South Wales. Sir Arthur Hodgson, the Mayor of Stratford, once a distinguished official in Queensland, where he made a large fortune, felicitously accepted the statue, and was pleasantly seconded by Sir Philip Cunliffe Owen. Oscar Wilde, the orator of the day, delivered a terse and poetic speech. Lord Ronald Gower gave a few modest, neat remarks in thanks, and then a large number of invited guests

were given a luncheon by the Mayor in the picture gallery of the memorial hall, where the portrait of Miss Ada Rehan, gorgeously dressed as Katherine, recently presented by Augustin Daly, looked down upon the table, surrounded by pictures of Mrs. Siddons, Mrs. Charles Kean, John Philip Kemble, Farren Phelps, Edwin Booth and others. Mr. George Augustus Sala, charged with the honorable task of proposing the toast to the "Immortal Memory of Shakespeare," made a very happy speech. Yet, he said, he was diffident though not reluctant to speak in praise of Shakespeare, for though he loved his plays,—

"he was not that which was known in this advanced age of scholarship as a Shakespearian scholar and critic. The old scholiast told us to beware of the man of one book. Now the plays of Shakespeare, next to one sublime Book, was the very book a man might select for his exclusive reading. Théophile Gautier said that he would not mind solitary confinement for life if the place of his incarceration could only be the Tribune in the Pitti Palace at Florence, for he would have the company of the Venus de Medici and 'The Fates' of Michael Angelo. So a man might say that he, too, would laugh at the misery and despair of a solitary cell if they would give him a shelf with the New Testament, Shakespeare, Spencer, Milton, and—whom else should he say?—perhaps Burton's 'Anatomy of Melancholy.' They knew that Shakespeare assuaged the misery of Louis Kossuth in his Austrian dungeon, and was the grammar, the lexicon, and the delectus of that illustrious patriot in his hard but triumphant struggle to master the difficulties of the English language. But the man of one book, and that book Shakespeare, was a very dangerous customer. He waited for you. He knew a hawk from a handsaw, or a hernsaw, or a hatchet, or a hyphen."

Mr. Sala also said:—

"It has been the fashion to laugh at Mr. Donnelly, to denounce him. He considered Mr. Donnelly to have been a great benefactor to the cause of Shakespeare and to literature in general. He had confirmed and strengthened them,—the devoted lovers of Shakespeare; and more than that, by adventuring a comparison between Shakespeare and Bacon, he would lead, he (Mr. Sala) hoped, to the works of Bacon being more attentively studied than they were, for the study of his works must inevitably purify and ennoble them in the cultivation of literature, and at the same time the lover of Shakespeare would see what an impassable gulf separated the utterances of Shakespeare from those of Bacon."

His speech closed with an eloquent tribute to the stage. He confessed himself a play-goer, and said:—

"When he thought of the play and playgoers he was joyfully reminded of the happy equality that bound all classes together in the congenial atmosphere of the playhouse. Did they know—the question was not impertinent, but rather a piece of Shakespearian lore—that *Hamlet* and *Richard III.* were performed on board a merchant ship at Sierra Leone in 1607, in the reign of James I., and that the skipper of the vessel entered in his log the memorable words, 'I suffered the crew to have this diversion to keep them from idleness, and sleep, and unlawful games.' He said that the playhouse, properly conducted with an entertainment calculated to refine and ennoble the mind, not only prevented sleep, and idleness, and unlawful games, but was decidedly a school of morals and virtue. In the sixpenny gallery, filled perhaps with rough and untutored people, there were souls that could sympathise with the noblest aspirations that could be uttered from the stage. He remembered, ever so many years ago, at the Old Surrey, then a rough theatre in a rough neighborhood, that the illustrious tragedian Macready was concluding an engagement. The play was *Lear*, and in the scene on the heath, in the storm where the desolate, discredited king, deserted by his children, and feeling rankling in his soul sharper than any serpent's tooth the thanklessness of his children, wrapped his regal mantle around the poor shivering fool, the all witless zany who had not deserted his master in his affliction, the house was hushed to utter silence, a silence broken only by the rough voice of a sailor in the gallery, who said, "Poor old buffer." If anything could add to the joy they felt that day, it was the knowledge that every year that passed the influence and the power of Shakespeare was increasing and spreading."

Lord Ronald began the statue in 1876, having first conceived the idea when walking in Central Park, New York, with his friend the well-known Mr. Sam Ward. The monument of Shakespeare erected in the park he thought finer than any Shakespeare memorial at home. In his own birthplace Shakespeare had no statue except the wretched one in the church and the equally inartistic production given by Garrick, placed outside the town hall. His first idea was to have a statue of the poet, afterward he added Hamlet representing philosophy, Falstaff comedy, Prince Hal history, and Lady Macbeth tragedy, each figure bearing an appropriate wreath and allegorical plants. Lady Macbeth holds poppies, emblematic of sleep and blood; Hamlet, cypress and ivy, representing mourning and eternity; Falstaff, a vine and hops; and Prince Hal, the rose of England and the lily of France.

The sculptor began his work at thirty years of age, working in Paris, and exhibiting there in the Salon the first models of the figures

that were to compose the statue. When the whole group was completed in plaster the committee of the Salon placed it in the centre of the garden, a position ever before reserved for a national work. The statue and groups in plaster were also exhibited at the Crystal Palace, London.

The whole expense as well as the design of the statue is due to Lord Ronald Gower, who has probably found its cost to be something like £10,000. Sir Arthur Hodgson and the Duke of Manchester are responsible for the pedestal and placing of the monument.

THE FOURNIER STATUE OF SHAKESPEARE.—To the munificence of Mr. William Knighton, an Australian magistrate now dwelling in Paris, and to the genius of M. Paul Fournier, the capital of France owes the statue of Shakespeare, dedicated on Sunday, the 14th of October. Mr. Knighton is a man of literary taste and ability, the author of "The Struggle for Existence" and other works that have been translated into French, and in his office of vice-president of the International Literary Association first met, at a convention of the association held in Madrid, with the sculptor, M. Paul Fournier, whose previous work—his group from *Othello*, and his *Ophelia*—seemed to designate him as the French artist especially fitted to carry into execution the idea Mr. Knighton had conceived—a statue of Shakespeare be given to Paris. M. Fournier has made Shakespeare standing, in court costume, a long drapery folded over his left arm falling behind him, his right hand holding an open book. Nobleness and serenity are seated upon the lofty brow and regular features, and the whole figure breathes of an ideal Shakespeare. The Municipal Council of Paris unanimously accepted the gift at its session on the 22d of June last, and at the unveiling ceremony, which took place where the statue now stands, at the corner of the Avenue de Messine and the Boulevard Haussmann. M. Mézières received it formally in the name of the Academy, M. Jules Claretie, representing the Théâtre-Français, made the address, and M. Mouet-Sully recited some verses composed by M. H. de Barnier. The work was cast by Barbedienne, and based upon a pedestal designed by M. Deglane, an architect who

this year obtained the medal of honor of the Salon. This pedestal is very simple, it bears the inscription—

WILLIAM
SHAKESPEARE
1564-1616,

and a scroll running along on each face among carved masques and fruits, bears the names of the great dramas: *Othello, Hamlet, Henry VIII, Richard III, La Tempête, Macbeth, Roi Lear, Roméo et Juliette*. The pedestal stands four metres and a-half high, the statue measures in height three metres and ten centimetres.

SHAKESPEARE'S MENTION OF THE WELSH.—That part of Mr. Gladstone's Eisteddfod speech at Wrexham, September 4th, which brought Shakespeare to witness to the glorification of the Welsh traditions ever patriotically commemorated in an Eisteddfod, is reported as follows:—

"On this occasion—in order to ascertain and get some light upon previous ideas about Wales—I would resort to the books of Shakespeare—to see what Shakespeare thought about the Welsh, and in the first place to compare his ideas of the Welsh with his ideas of the Irish and Scotch. If you take his ideas of the Irish they are very soon disposed of. He mentions them very seldom—and when he does mention them it is in a manner far from agreeable to the Irishman. But with regard to the Scotch, I think he was slightly more respectful. You would find it not easy to get a very good character of the Scotch out of the plays of Shakespeare. Now, whatever be the cause, it is of considerable interest, in my opinion, to look to what he has said of the Welsh, and that I can venture for the most part to quote without fear in this assembly. There is one part of it where I must tax your patience and self-denial a little; and I think I had better get rid of that first, in order, like the children, to keep the best part of the helping of pudding they have received to the last. I will refer first to the case in which Shakespeare is least flattering to Wales, and that is the case of what was, after all, an exceedingly respectable man—namely, the clergyman, Sir Hugh Evans, in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*. Sir Hugh Evans comes into conflict with Falstaff, and therefore, of course, becomes the butt of Falstaff; because, just as Cromwell, for example, when he was in the field knocked down everybody that opposed him, so Falstaff, although he was apt to run away from the field of battle, yet in the field of contest of wit he was superior to all mankind; and even Prince Henry, afterwards King

Henry V., got the worst of it when he came to loggerheads with Falstaff in a tournament of wit. So it was no wonder if Falstaff took certain liberties with Sir Hugh Evans. Sir Hugh Evans was dressed up in the *Merry Wives of Windsor* as a fairy to pinch Falstaff, who called him three things. They are none of them very bad. First of all, he called him a Welsh goat; secondly, he called him a piece of the toasted cheese; and thirdly, when he professed to be very much exhausted and dejected, he complained of him and said, "I am not able to answer the Welsh flannel." I believe that is all that Shakespeare said in mischief. You have heard the worst of it, and it is not very bad. But here is a curious thing as it appears to me, and that was that there was a Welsh parson, as he is called, I think, in the play. At that time they had not taken many Welsh clergymen to Windsor, but they had imported in the last century a great many English clergymen to be bishops and priests in Wales, with what consequences to the welfare of the Church you know too well. And that is a point on which, unhappily, there can be no difference of opinion. But it is a curious circumstance that Shakespeare should have produced a Welsh clergyman at Windsor, and my explanation of it is that the presence of the Welsh clergyman at Windsor, and also some good words which Shakespeare used about the Welsh, were due to the strong predilection of Queen Elizabeth for Wales. Queen Elizabeth is a person with respect to whom in her character as a woman there may be many criticisms and differences of opinion, yet she is a woman to whom, in my opinion, Englishmen owe an immeasurable debt, and whom Welshmen ought to remember with respect. You owe to her in the main the translation of the Bible, and the translation of the Bible in Welsh has been what it was in England—a national institution, a prop and buttress to the language. Moreover, I believe that, altogether, not Elizabeth only, but the prior Sovereigns of the Tudor race had a friendly feeling toward Wales. And now I am coming to loggerheads for a moment with my friend the president. He said that Henry VIII. passed a law restricting the use of the language. Well, I am a man who likes to be cautious. I will not say whether that is so or not, but I will give you what is said by Mr. Lewis in his interesting pamphlet, called "The Welshman in English literature." Mr. Lewis says that there were fifteen penal Acts in force against Wales, Welshmen, and the Welsh tongue at the time when the Tudor family came to the throne in the person of Henry VII.; but Mr. Lewis declares, and I hope the chairman will not contradict it, that these Acts were repealed upon a petition of the people in the reign of Henry VIII. Therefore, that was a time, according to that statement, very favorable to the people of Wales—that was the time when Flintshire, the county with which we are connected, first came into existence as a county—that was the time when Wales was organized in shires, when the local government of England was given to Wales, and Wales has greatly profited by that similarity of insti-

tutions. Let us see what Shakespeare says about the Welsh in other places. In the first place, he introduces Fluellyn in the play of *Henry the Fifth*, and Fluellyn proves himself to be not only a gallant soldier, but a wise captain, and Shakespeare has remarked in his favor this line, 'There is much care and valor in this Welshman.' Care and valor. If you can get care and valor united in a soldier you have got the main part of a good basis upon which to build a solid character, but that is not all. I have told you how he speaks in his works with regard to other inhabitants of these islands; he speaks of the 'trusty' Welshman, he speaks of the 'loving' Welshman; and the Duke of Buckingham, when in the field, is spoken of as 'backed with the hardy Welshmen.' Shakespeare, then, calls the Welsh trusty, loving, and hardy. What else do you desire? He could not have done it better if he had received his education in the Eisteddfod. To describe a nation as being trusty, as being affectionate, and as being brave and enduring you have left very little indeed which I can add to the character. These, I think, were very good times, and Shakespeare was a great man, and you can have no more distinguished and illustrious title to fall back upon than by citing what he has thought and what he has said of the Welsh. I do not doubt in my own mind that some portion of the credit ought to be reflected upon Queen Elizabeth, because Shakespeare added to his other qualities that of being a good courtier and a loyal king and queen worshipper, and I have no doubt he considered a little what would be acceptable in high quarters when he penned these remarkable eulogies of the Welsh people. Still I have no doubt his heart assented."

A MEMORIAL TO MARLOWE.—An influential committee has been formed recently in London, whose purpose is to erect a memorial to Christopher Marlowe. The kind of memorial to be established has not yet been determined upon. The committee numbers among its members Robert Browning, A. H. Bullen, of the British Museum, the editor of the series of Elizabethan Dramatists published by Nimmo, Lord Coleridge, Professor E. Dowden, W. I. Evelyn, Havelock Ellis, the editor of *The Mermaid Series*, Dr. Furnivall, Edmund Gosse, Rev. A. B. Grosart, Professor Hales, Henry Irving, James Russell Lowell, Frank Marshall, Algernon C. Swinburne.

THE BATTLE OF MORTIMER.—In describing the scene of the battle of Mortimer's Cross, in *3 Henry VI*, II, i, Shakespeare puts in the mouths of Edward and Richard a memorable description of the phenomenon of the parhelion or mock sun:—

Edw. Dazzle my eyes, or do I see three suns?

Rich. Three glorious suns, each one a perfect sun ;

Not separated with the racking clouds,

But sever'd in a pale, clear-shining sky.

See, see! they join, embrace, and seem to kiss,

As if they vow'd some league inviolable :

• Now are they but one lamp, one light, one sun,

In this the heaven figures some event.

Edw. 'Tis wondrous strange, the like yet never heard of.

I think it cites us, brother, to the field,

That we the sons of brave Plantagenet,

Each one already blazing by our meeds,

Should notwithstanding join our lights together,

And over-shine the earth as this the world.

Whate'er it bodes, henceforward will I bear

Upon my target three fair-shining suns.

Referring to this in a recent number of *Notes and Queries*, Mr. John Pickford recalls the fact that "the old chronicler Hollinshed has also an allusion to this circumstance, 'at which tyme the *son* (as some write) appeared to the Earle of Marche like three *sunnes* and sodainely joyned altogether in one.' Whether the parhelion really did take this form may be doubted. But it is a fact that the Earl of March, afterwards Edward VI, bore as his device the sun in his splendor. The phenomenon was regarded by him as a good omen of success, and it is curious to note that the sun appearing and dispelling the fog on the morning of the battle of Austerlitz, nearly four hundred years afterwards, was hailed by Napoleon Bonaparte as a similar good omen. 'The sun of Austerlitz' passed into a proverb in the days of the Empire."

Mr. Pickford adds, as to the news of the defeat and death of Richard, Duke of York, reaching his sons when preparing for the battle, that in this the account of Shakespeare is in error. They "must have received the intelligence much earlier, as the battle of Wakefield was fought on December 31st, 1460, and so at Mortimer's Cross, on Candlemas Day, February 2d, 1461, some messenger 'bloody with spurring, fiery red with haste' must have arrived long before."

THEATRE PRICES IN QUEEN ELIZABETH'S TIME.—Even taking into consideration the difference in the value of money, the prices of

admission to the theatre in the reign of Queen Bess were much less than are now charged. The prices varied from two-pence in the gallery to a shilling in the lords' room, which was situated over the stage, where stage boxes are now in old fashioned theatres. Ben Jonson, in the prologue to "Every Man Out of his Humour," acted for the first time at the Globe on Bankside, in 1599, says, "An' I do, let me die poisoned by some venomous hiss, and never live to look so high as the two-penny room again;" and in the same play mention is made of the "lords' room over the stage." Decker, in his "Belman of London: Bringing to Light the most notorious Villanies that are now practised in the Kingdome, 1608," also says, "Pay you two-pence to a player, and you may sit in the gallery," while in one of Middleton's plays we find "one of them is a nip; I took him once into the two-penny gallery at the Fortune." It appears that the price of admission to the lords' room, over the stage, at the period alluded to was one shilling, for Decker in the *Gul's Horne-booke*, 1609, says, "at a new play you take up the twelve-penny room, next the stage, because the lords and you may seem to bee hail fellow well met."

Theatrical managers, most of whom are at their wits' end for new devices for catching the public taste, might take a hint from the age of Elizabeth and establish lords' rooms at their theatres. The sucking bloods, the shoddy dudes, the would-be men-about-town, the simious mashers, and the crowd who value a thing exclusively by its cost would contribute royally to the receipts.